DOCUMENT RESUME

 $02347 - [\lambda 1332301]$

[Protest against the Award of a Construction Contract]. B-188198. May 6, 1977. 2 pp.

Decision re: Robert Dougan Construction Co.; by Paul G. Dembling, Acting Comptroller General.

Issue Area: Pederal Procurement of Goods and Services (1900).
Contact: Office of the General Counsel: Procurement Law I.
Budget Punction: General Government: General Property and
Records Hanagement (804).

Organization Concerned: Elkhorn Construction Co.: White & Sons Construction, Inc.: Veterans Administration: Fort Lyon, CO.

The protester alleged that a notation in the low bid, which increased the price if offeror was awarded only one of two schedules in the invitation, rendered the bid nonresponsive. Since the low bidder was awarded both schadules, and the notation played no part in the evaluation for award process, the protest was denied. (Author/SC)

B Circles
Pro 7

2347 C

DECIBION



THE COMPTROLLER GENERAL OF THE UNITED STATES WASHINGTON, D.C. 20548

FILE: B-188198

DATE: liay 6, 1977

MATTER OF: Robert Dougan Construction Company

DIGEST:

Protest that notation in low bid, which increased price if awarded only one of two achedules in invitation, called for rejection of bid as non-responsive is denied because low bidder was awarded both schedules and notation played no part in evaluation for award process.

Robert Dougan Construction Company (Dougan) protests any award of a contract to either Elkhorn Construction Company (Elkhorn), the low bidder, or White & Sons Construction, Inc. (White), the second low bidder, for the construction of a sewage treatment facility (schedule I) and the repair or replacement of storm and sanitary sewage lines (schedule II) under invitation for bids (IFB) No. 567-77-5, issued by the Veterans Administration (VA), Fort Lyon, Colorado.

Since the award has recently been made to the low bidder, and in view of our conclusion below, we will not discuss the protest against the award to the second low bidder.

The IFB was issued on November 1, 1976, and was opened as scheduled on December 29, 1976. Ten bids were received with five bidders submitting bids on all items in schedules I and II and the remaining bidders submitting bids only for the items in schedule I. The bids of the three low bidders are as follows:

| | Schedule I | | Schedule II | | | | |
|---------|------------|---------|-------------|---------|---------|---------|---------|
| | Item 1 | Item 2 | Item 1 | Item 2 | Item 3 | Item 4 | Item 5 |
| Elkhorn | 586,000 | 585,000 | 198,000 | 190,000 | 176,000 | 173,000 | 160,000 |
| White | 638,000 | 635,000 | 247,000 | 233,000 | 228,000 | 223,000 | 207,000 |
| Dougan | 673,000 | 673,000 | NB | NB | NB | EN | NB |

B-188198

The basis for award as stated in the IPB was:

"AWARD: A single award will be made on Item No. 1 of Schedule I and Item No. 1 of Schedule II but in the event the offer(s) exceed the funds available, single awards will be made on Item 2 of Schedule I and Item 2, 3, 4, or 5 of Schedule II. Offerors should quote a price on each item listed for Schedule I OR each item listed for Schedule II. Offerors desiring to bid on both Schedules may do so."

Elkhorn's bid noted that "If awarded only schedule II add \$30,000 to schedule II." The award to Elkhorn was for item 1 on both schedules. Dougan contends that the above notation on the Elkhorn bid calls for rejection of the bid as nonresponsive because (1) there is no provision in the IFB for such an alternate bid; (2) the IFB states that unless called for, alternate bids will not be considered; and (3) the bid has taken exception to the bidding conditions by limiting the firm's obligation to perform.

Because the award to Elkhorn covered item 1 in both schedules, the notation to which Dougan objects played no part in the evaluation for award process because that contingency never occurred. Consequently, the protest is denied.

Acting Comptroller General of the United States